

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

con

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,289	01/16/2007	Robert Owen	288922US0PCT	5509
	7590 02/08/200 AK MCCLELLAND I	EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
	•			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/574,289	OWEN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Wayne Langel	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,						
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. 9 period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	PATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	ATION. Ily be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 J	anuary 2008.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)[) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-9 and 13-16</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
·—	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
,	6) Claim(s) <u>1,3,5-9 and 14-16</u> is/are rejected.					
	7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13</u> is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
الــاره	are subject to restriction and	or orodan roquiromani.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine		South data by the Francisco			
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 January 2008</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
·						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🔲 Info	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		formal Patent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minamikawa et al in view of Devos et al. Minamikawa et al disclose at col. 1, lines 51-54 that various techniques may be used in combination for purifying hydrogen peroxide, including a filtration process using a membrane in combination with an adsorption process using a resin. The difference between the process disclosed by Minamikawa et al, and that recited in claims 1, 3, 8 and 14-16, is that Minamikawa et al do not specifically disclose that the membrane should be a reverse osmosis membrane. Devos et al disclose at col. 2, lines 4-7 that various techniques may be used to purify hydrogen peroxide solutions, including reverse osmosis. It would be obvious from Devos et al to employ a reverse osmosis membrane as the membrane in the process of Minamikawa et al, since one of ordinary skill in the art would expect that any known or suitable type of purification membrane would function as the membrane. Regarding claims 5-7 and 9, Minamikawa et al suggest at col. 2, lines 36-46 t6hat UV (ultraviolet light) may be used as a purification technique. Applicants' argument, that nothing in the refernces discloses or suggests the specific combination of reverse osmosis membrane purification followed by at least one other purification selected from the group consisting of exposure to ultraviolet light, exposure to ozone, and contact with at least one adsorption resin, is not convincing, since there is no evidence on record of unexpected

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

results which would emanate from a combination of purification steps in the order as recited in applicants' claims, as opposed to the reverse order.

Claim 13 is objected to as based on a rejected parent claim, and would be allowed if written in independent form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 am - 3:30 pm Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000. Wayne A, Jang & Wayne Langel

Application/Control Number: 10/574,289

Art Unit: 1793

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793